APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TITLE VI STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
1120 N STREET
P. O. BOX 942873
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001
PHONE (916) 654-5266
FAX (916) 654-6608
TTY (916) 653-4086

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

January 14, 2005

TITLE VI
POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, ensures that no person in the State of California shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity it administers.

WILL KEMPTON
Director

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTAL TRAFFIC REVIEW

Abrams Associates
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, INC.

May 15, 2006

Joe Broadhead
Environmental Data Systems, Inc.
1136 35th Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95822

Re: Comparison of Alternatives for the Shingle Springs Rancheria

Dear Mr. Broadhead:

Per your request, this letter provides a summary of our trip generation analyses and review of traffic impacts for the two new alternatives that are being analyzed as part of the Shingle Springs Interchange Supplemental EIR. The alternatives include a reduced casino/hotel alternative and a reduced casino alternative (without the hotel).

In summary, we have verified that the proposed alternatives would generate less traffic than the proposed project and also that the reduced traffic of the alternatives would still require the interchange project. With the reduced traffic from the two alternatives the same project mitigations would still be required and there would be no changes to the conclusions about the preferred interchange design.

The trip generation methodology used in this analysis and a review of the project alternatives are presented below.

Trip Generation Methodology

As mentioned above, there are two development alternatives being analyzed for this report. Both include a casino and one also includes a hotel. The trip generation methodology for each component is described below and the resulting rates are shown in Table 1.

Hotel Trip Generation Rates - The number of trips generated by the hotel was estimated using trip rates from the *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, Seventh Edition.*[1] However, the ITE rates for a hotel do not reflect the interaction between a hotel other uses (such as a casino) on the same site. Extensive studies of hotel trip generation at casinos has shown that there are a substantial number of trips shared between the hotel and the casino. If no reductions are made to the overall project trip generation or the casino rates then it is appropriate to reduce the number of hotel trips to account for trips shared with the casino. The Shingle Springs Rancheria

[1] Trip Generation - An Informational Report, 7th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, D. C., 2003.

Interchange TIA[2] concluded that a hotel with a casino would generate about 25 percent of the trips that would be generated by a stand-alone hotel.

Table 1
Project Trip Generation Assumptions

Trip Generation Rates							
		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
Land Use	Daily Rate	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Casino (per 100 square feet)	62.20	1.33	0.63	1.96	2.15	1.99	4.14
Casino Hotel (per room)	3.26	0.14	0.10	0.24	0.13	0.13	0.26

Casino Trip Generation Rates - The ITE Trip Generation Manual is generally the standard reference from which to determine trip generation rates. However, the rates for a casino included in the latest edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual are based on surveys of six casino/video lottery establishments taken in South Dakota in the 1990's. The square footages of the surveyed facilities ranged from 600 to 2,400 square feet. Based on a comparison of this rate with other studies it was found that use of the ITE rate was inappropriate and produced results that did not compare with the expected patronage of the Proposed Action. In addition, the rates used in these analyses have been approved by a judge as part of a lawsuit associated with the Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Traffic Operations Analysis, dated August 8, 2001.

Pass-By Traffic - Pass-by trips are project trips that are assumed to enter the site and then resume travel in the same direction. They are trips made as intermediate stops on the way from an origin to a primary destination. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing on an adjacent street or freeway and are not considered new trips on the roadway network. The Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Traffic Operations Analysis included a detailed analysis of the potential for pass-by traffic. This analysis was thorough and was based on extensive surveys from other casinos, the traffic volumes on U.S. 50, and a marketing study conducted for the project. Our review indicates that the previously assumed pass-by reductions are reasonable and that they should still be considered valid.

For the purposes of this analysis the pass-by traffic would not be a factor in the comparison of the alternatives since all three alternatives would be expected to have the same pass-by reductions. Therefore, since all alternatives would have the same pass-by reductions the total trip generation can be used to compare of the traffic generated by the alternatives. In summary, the comparison of the alternatives would not be affected by the pass-by reductions so the unadjusted trip generation may be used.

Trip Generation for the Proposed Action

[2] Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange – Traffic Impact Analysis, Davis Evans and Associates, Roseville, CA, August, 2001.

To provide an accurate comparison to the alternatives the original project trip generation rates have been used for all trip generation calculations. However, as part of our analysis we did review the project trip rates to verify that the conclusions in the Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Traffic Operations Analysis should still be considered valid. The trip generation for the proposed action and the two alternative are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Trip Generation for the
Shingle Springs Casino Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Weekday ADT	AM In	AM Out	AM Total	PM In	PM Out	PM Total
Trip Generation for the Proposed Action (Casino and Hotel)	238,500 sq. ft. Casino 250-room hotel	9,918	514	2258	739	646	573	1,219
Alternative D - Reduced Casino with Hotel	120,000 sq. ft. Casino 200-room hotel	5,140	266	117	383	330	294	624
Alternative E - Reduced Casino (Without Hotel)	120,000 sq. ft. Casino	4,728	248	107	355	314	280	594

Reduced Casino/Hotel Alternative - Alternative "D"

This alternative includes a reduced casino with 120,000 square feet and a reduced hotel with only 200 rooms. For this alternative the trip generation was estimated to be 383 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 624 vehicles per hour during the critical PM peak. This equates to a reduction in the trips from the Proposed Action of just over 50%. However, because of the existing access constraints at the Shingle Springs Rancheria a new interchange would still be required to accommodate the traffic from this alternative. In addition, the conclusions about the selected interchange alternative (the Modified Trumpet Design) and other roadway design elements associated with the project would remain unchanged. Therefore, the conclusions in the Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Traffic Operations Analysis should also be considered valid and applicable for Alternative "D". No additional off-site traffic mitigations would be required. The resulting trip generation for Alternative "D" is shown in Table 2.

Reduced Casino Alternative (Without Hotel) - Alternative "E"

This alternative includes a reduced casino with 120,000 square feet and no hotel. For this alternative the trip generation was estimated to be 355 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 594 vehicles per hour during the critical PM peak. This equates to a reduction in the trips from the Proposed Action of more than 50%. However, as with Alterative "D", because of the access constraints in the area a new interchange would still be required to accommodate the traffic from this alternative. In addition, the conclusions about the selected interchange alternative (the Modified Trumpet Design) and other

roadway design elements associated with the project would also remain unchanged with this alternative. Therefore, the conclusions in the Shingle Springs Rancheria Interchange Traffic Operations Analysis should also be considered valid and applicable for Alternative "E". No additional off-site traffic mitigations would be required. The resulting trip generation for Alternative "E" is shown in Table 2.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this information and we'll talk to you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen C. Abrams
Vice President
T.E. License No. 1852